

1 of 2


issue is not appropriate for interlocutory review. *See* § 1292(b). The Court noted that even assuming the exemption were valid, the present case (a simple insurance action based on denial of coverage) did not involve a significant matter of public policy.¹ That determination, which was controlling, was a mixed question of law and fact of the type not suitable for interlocutory review.

CONCLUSION

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion for a Certificate of Appealability (ECF No. 28) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 30th day of April, 2015.



ROBERT C. JONES
United States District Judge

¹ The Court notes that the Nevada Supreme Court has announced a “*strong* public policy” in favor of arbitration, *D.R. Horton, Inc. v. Green*, 96 P.3d 1159, 1162 (Nev. 2004) (emphasis added), so an exemption from an arbitration requirement that is itself based on public policy concerns would have to implicate a public policy issue powerful enough to overcome the strong policy of reducing litigation costs. A simple insurance action does not rise to that level.